THE CREDIT MOBILIER.

THE END NOT YET.

RESTITUTION TO THE GOVERNMENT DEMANDED— HOW MR. AMES'S MEMORY WAS REFRESHED— WHAT MR. ALLEY THINKS ABOUT IT.

[PROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.] WASHINGTON, Jan. 7 .- The Crédit Mobilier scandal was not allowed to rest with the passage of the resolution yesterday, ordering the Committee to open their doors. Mr. Randall, who had watching his opportunity all day, finally got in a resolution stating the fact that the Pacific Railroad was in default over \$5,000,000 to the Government on account of interest on their bonds, and that this default was mainly caused by the enermous and illegal payments of money and stock to the Credit Mobilier, and requesting the President to employ two lawyers to prosecute the Credit Mobilier Company and its stockholders individually, in the courts, to recover the amount due the Gov-The House bad apparently struck with a paofe by the thought of the impending developments in the wretched Crédit Mobilier business, and nearly half of the members and started for home, looking sick and disgusted. Before Mr. Randall offered his resolution, no quorum could be found to vote on it until there had been two roll calls. Finally it was d, with but 23 votes in the negative.

Notwithstanding the fact that the House vesterday removed the injunction of secreey from the proceedings heretofore held by the Crédit Mobilier Committee, it is believed that no exact copy of the testimony as originally given will ever be made public. The reason for this is that each person testifying has been allowed to revise his lestimony, and some of the witnesses have changed their testimony, it is believed, as their mem-erics have been refreshed by those who proved to be owners of Credit Mobilier stock. Besides, the statements of what occurred in the Committee-room made by members of the Committee, do not fully agree with the testimony as written out for publication. Oakes Ames and John B. Alley appear to be perfectly satisfied with the condition of affairs and talk upon the subject with perfeet freedom. Mr. Alley says that it is remarkable what good memories some of the Congressmen have whose names have been mentioned, and what a poor one Mr. Ames has. He gives as an instance the fact that some of the members approached Mr. Ames lately and inquired as to his memory regarding them and their relations on the Mebilier subject. Mr. Ames, according to Mr. Alley, would, in the simplicity of his nature, tell them candidly and honestly just what occurred. The members in two or three cases then told Mr. Ames that he did not remember correctly; that it would be impossible for him to do so when so much was on his mind. "Then," said Mr. 'Alley, "these members would tell Mr. Ames how they understood it, and that he was wrong and they right. Why, Sir, some of them ma e the pretilest and most innocent report of what occurre t that the human intellect could imagine. They were all ant of course of any money, Now, Oakes Ames is the most honest-minded man you almost ever saw. He is, indeed, Sir; and if any action is taken toward making him carry the sins of the members who were supplied with stock, the country will find out that other people know something which it would not be healthy for some other people to have known. I tell you, Sir, that Oakes Ames is an honest man. Of course, he has a good feeling toward members, and purhaps has sometimes accepted the memory of others where his own was not clear. This thing is

"How is McComb ?" was asked. "McComb is a very bad man, and Durant is another." "Then you don't think Oakes Ames was to blame?" "At any rate," he replied, "he had more offers for Crédit Mobi from members of Congress than he could supply."

THE CASE STATED. A CLEAR SYNOPSIS OF THE CREDIT MOBILIER

From The Boston Traveller.

The Union Pacific Railroad was incorporated with a land grant of 10 square miles for every mile of the road, to start at the 100th meridian and go west to the Rocky Mountains, or until it met the Central Pacific, which was started in San Francisco, at the point in the mountains where either should have built to in the gress of the work. Beside that, each had a grant by the United States of a six per cent band of \$16,000 per mile for the first certain number of miles, say 207 miles. Then, it being assumed that the next 600 miles, going through a desert country, would be worse to build, it had a bond of \$52,000 per mile for that distance; and then, as the read approached the Rocky Mountains, where it was deemed by Congress to be pretty nearly equivalent to going through Hoosae Mountain, the bond was made

The stock was subscribed for say at \$10,000,000, although that may not be the exact amount. The subscribers were called upon to pay in five per cent. It ap-pears that they took all the assets of the road-its land, is United States bonds, and what had been subscribed by the stockholders-and gave them to another corporation to build the read, so that the stockholders had paidun stock at \$100 per share issued to them for their subwould be more than enough to build the road.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CREDIT MOBILIER.

For this purpose, the "Gredit Mobilier of America" was incorporated in the State of Pennsylvania, empowered, among other things, to build railroads. The Credit Mobilier consisted, in its stockholders, of the same men who subscribed to the Union Pacific Road, so that the stockholders of the Union Pacific Road and the stock-holders of the Crédit Mobilier, except the men who were taken in afterwards, "to do the most good" to the road, were the same parties. When the Union Pacific Road let the first 207 miles to the Credit Mobilier to build, it gave all the assets of the Union Pacific Railroad, to wit; the land grant, the United States bonds, which were to be secured by a first mortgage on the road, and whatever was paid in on the stock to the Union Pacific, and what ever was donated by the inhabitants of counties or towns along the line of the road, in payment for the expense of building the road. The profits of building the road were thus to be divided among the stockholders of the Union Pacific through the firm of the Crédit Mobilier.

But it turned out on examination that this first 200 miles might not give very great profits to the Crédit

Mobilier over the cost of building; first, because the land along this end of it had been taken considerably by settlers; secondly, it was a well-watered country, and required very considerable trestle-work bridges, and it not appear to be as profitable an investment as at first it was thought to be under that contract. But still it was a reasonably good thing.
Of the Crédit Mobilier stock of \$4,000,000, \$55,000 at par, or

650 shares, were set apart for what is known in the management as a "peculiar purpose," and Mr. Thomas C. Durant, who was Vice-President and Managing Director of the Union Pacific Read, subscribed for it, and it stood in his name, but he did not pay it in.

A GREAT SWINDLE. About this time a bright thought struck the promoters of the enterprise, that they would put a second mortgage on to the road, on the same amounts per mile as the Government mortgage, and give these bonds to the Credit Mobilier to build the road with; and if they could build it with what they had before, these mortgage bonds would be a clear profit to be divided among themselves. But that mortgage would not be a very valuable one, son that the first mortgage to the United States to secure its bonds, covered when built all the road would be worth, and something more. Thereupon another still brighter thought struck them. If they o get the Government to subrogate its mortgage to this second mortgage, the second mortgage bonds would be thus made nearly if not quite par. The proposition however, was to be got through Congress, and it seemed rather a steep undertaking, harder in fact than building the road over the Rocky Mountains, because the road in fact was already mortgaged to the United States for more 2than it would cost to build it, and the United States mortgage would the eby be rendered worthless. Indeed, wastefully as it was built, the whole road cost only about \$22,000,000, and its bonded mortgage debt exceeds \$71,000,000. But the great necessity of having the road built, and the claim that it could not be built without the desired bonds, which was to be put forward, it was thought would commend it to Congress, or at least justify Congress to the people, if that body could be induced to pass an act which was in effect to give up the mortgage of the United States, to the stockholders; and Mr. Ames and Mr. Du rant were anthorized to use this "Peculiar Stock" for the purpose of aiding the passage of that proposition through Congress; and they promised blocks of this peculiar stock to their lobby agents and to their friends, Mr.

A. and Mr. C., "wherever it would do most good," in

the language of Mr. Ames's letters. Mr. Durant, being a Democrat, dealt with the Democratic members, and

Mr. Ames, being a Republican, dealt with the Republican

members of Congress; and they promised the stock in

blocks of ten, twenty, twenty-five and fifty shares, upon condition that whoever received it should pay the par value. Mostlof the members were let into the whole

thing that was to be done. They therefore were ready to

once. Others, who perhaps it was thought might host-tate if they saw the whole scheme, fearing so great a division of profits at the expense of the people might be overhauled, were not let in fully, but were told it was to be a good investment, that Mr. Ames would guarantee ten per cent on the par value; and that would make it a good thing for which Congressmen were subscribing. EFFECT OF THE TRANSACTION.

This act subrogating the United States mortgage to

the second mortgage, by which the United States mortcage was rendered worthless and the second mortgage took all the value there was, was thereupon passed, and the Crédit Mobilier stock went up 300 or 400 per cent, and members of Congress and others who had doubts about taking it lest it might not be a "good thing" became very clamorous to get it, and they called upon Mr. Ames and Mr. Durant for their stock. These gentlemen came before the Crédit Mobilier stockholders and said substantially. "We must have more stock this 650 shares, because, while we don't know that we promised any more, people now come and claim that we promised them 50 shares where we supposed we had promised only 25, and we want this

extra amount to make good these claims, for it is necessary to keep in with Congress." After a good deat of controversy, Durant and Ames each insisting that they must have the stock, to make good their several promises, the Company came to the conclusion to water the stock, so as to give Mr. Ames 343 shares, and Mr. Durant shares, and so Ames and Durant got stock enough to answer their contracts, and took it and distributed it

among their friends, where they had promised it.

ANOTHER SMART TRANSACTION. Everything was thus going on well; but the Crédit Mobilier here met with a little set-back. The State of Pennsylvania, finding that they had this very rich corpo ration under their control, and being naturally desirous to tax everything taxable, called upon the Credit Mobilier to pay one-half per cent on its dividends; and as they were to make such very igreat dividends, the tax was a pretty large matter, and was to be avoided, if possible, because the promoters of the enterprise had very natural objections to paying out money that they were not going to pay to themselves. Therefore they let the contract to build the remainder of the road to Oakes Ames for \$48,000,000, being the portion on which there was a mortgage bond of \$64,000 per mile, \$32,000 to the United States and \$32,000 to the second mortgage, and the rest \$95,000 per mile-that is to say, \$18,000 to the United States and \$48,000 to the second mortgage, which by act of Congress had now become the first mortgage-to build, with the understanding that he was to assign this forty-eight million contract for building the road to the stockholders of the Credit Mobilier, but not to the Credit Mobilier itself, because then the dividends, or profits, would be taxed by the State of Pennsylvania. But by assigning this contract to the stockholders there would not be any dividends for the corporation; for building that piece of read, for doing which there were to be very great profits made therefrom, depends upon how one reckons these dividends. If you call the stock of the road, say 50 per cent, and the bonds at par, then they were many millions. If one reckons the profits when the bonds were worth no more than 26 cents on the dollar, and the stock 10 cents on the dollar, then the profits were not so much. So the difference is in the valuation of the profits as they divided the bonds and stock among themselves, and it is likely very different versions of the profits will be sworn to by the witnesses in the investigation. The land along the line all went in also toward building the road as a part of the profits.

THE M'COMB TROUBLE. Then another trouble came upon these enterprising gentlemen. Mr. McComb, who was a director on the Union Pacific road, and also a large owner of the Crédit Mobilier stock, came in and said: "Gentlemen, I subscribe for 250 shares, or \$25,000 worth of the Credit Mobiller stock, for Mr. Fant of Richmond. Mr. Fant, when you called upon him to pay up his subscription, before the stock became so valuable as it is now, was unable to do it. You called upon me and I gave you my check, and now I want my stock," But they said to him, "There is no stock for you; it is all divided up now." But he said, "There is the 'peculiar stock' that Ames and Durant had." They said, "But that has been disposed of." Well, then," said McComb, "water the stock as you did, for them, and give me what I paid for." "No," they replied; "we will inot do that. You take your \$25,000, which you say you have paid, and be quiet. You have got your share as an original subscriber with the rest; and there is no reason why you should have for yourseit \$25,000 paid in for Fant stock which has become worth

And thereupon there arose an euroclydon, or, as it is translated, a "tempectuous wind." They thereupon denied that McComb ever paid even the \$25,000; but he insisted that he had paid it and upon his legal rights, but said: "I will submit all this question between us to Judge Nelson of New York of the Supreme Court, and will abide by his decision, whatever that decision may be." That proposition was submitted to a committee of the stockholders of the Credit Mobilier, and two of them. Oliver Ames and Thomas C. Durant, reported in favor of it. The other member, Mr. John B. Alley, insisted that he would not have any such thing done. McComb was willing to take of the majority of the committee, and tried in various ways to get a reference, but failed to get it

M'COMB SUSPECTS AMES.

It occurred to him, however, that perhaps Ames had not distributed this stock, although he said he had. If he had not distributed this stock which stood in his name, then Ames held the stock in trust for the Crédit Mobilier, and of course had it in trust for McComb, if he could make good his claim. Thereupon McComb went to making inquicies of men, who said they had not had it where Ames said they did have it. Then he thought that Ames was cheating him, and said to him, "You must give me this stock, which you have not distributed, as you said you had; you have got enough to do it standing in your name; you must settle this matter with me."
Ames refused. "Taen," said McComb, "I must bring a suit and expose this whole affair, and that I don't want to do. I don't want to get these people mad with me. I am in railroad enterprises, and don't want to stir up a hornet's nest here. You don't want to have this exposed." Ames replied that he did not care anything about that; everybody knew that Congressmen were bribed; he could bribe any of them, and that McComb might telifallihe knew or not, as he pleased.

THE LAWSUIT.

Thereupon McComb brought his bill in equity, and called upon Mr. Ames upon oath to testify. McComb apparently thought that his best plan, as a railroad man, was to leave out the members of Congress; and there-fore he instructed his counsel, Judge Black, not to put on the bill in equity the names of the parties, but simply to aver that the stock had been illegally distributed. Judge Black objected to this, because the bill so drawn might not be a good one unless the names of all who beld the stock improperly were on it, and required of McComb a written instruction to put the case in that form, to guard himself from the imputation of being a poor law,

yer.

This McComb gave him, as he was very anxious, as a postage of the credit Mobilier, not to expose the means by which the laws by which the companies had been established, and made profitable, had been passed; and he hoped, by keeping this secret, that it would be easier to make a settlement with Ames and the Credit Mobilier, and get his money; so the bill in equity fonly referred to the transactions and Ames's letters in a general way. To this bill so framed Ames answered upon his oath that he never wrote any such letters, and that he never distributed any such stock.

any such stock.

THE DEVELOPMENT. The matter was referred to a Master in Chancery take testimony. It is probable that Mr. McMurtrie of Philadelphia, Ames's lawyer, believed Ames's oath, and did not believe there was any transaction such as was set forth in McComb's bill, and insisted, therefore, before the Master in Chancery, that McComb should profore the Master in Chancery, that McComb should produce his letters and stock list, showing the members who had received the stock. McComb tried to avoid that as much as possible, because then the whole facts would come out. But Mr. McMurrie still insisted; whereupon McComb did produce his letters and put sworn copies on file. Then the case laid along until last Summer, during the Presidential campaign; Mr. McMurtrie, kept his papers carelessly, and a reporter of The New-York Sun stole the nances from Amer's lawyer's office. Then came papers carelessly, and according to The Tork and Tork as tole the papers from Ames's lawyer's office. Then came the publication, followed by the denials of gentlemen who were implicated, that they had ever had any stock; but McComb held his tongue, made no statements, nor said anything about it, and was only sorry that the thing had come out.

THE DENIALS AND THE INVESTIGATION. Mr. Blaine's case was published against him earlier than anybody else, because his election came off in September; and he promptly denied his having had any of the stock. The facts about Mr. Blaine, as near as can be ascertained, are, that Ames offered him some ten snares of the stack only. Blaine looked it over and came to the conclusion that he would not have anything to do with it. When the publication was made Mr. Blaine made a denial. That was unfortunate, because it rendered it necessary that every other member of Congress in pilicated should make a like denial. When he came to Congress it became evident that an investigation would be pressed, and as Blaine was one of the accused parties, he could not sit in the chair as Speaker and appoint a committee. Therefore he though his best way was to go on the floor and ask for a committee, because he knew that he was all clear, and had a right to suppose, from the dennis of the others, that they stood in the same position. What his private belief on his point was, he cally knows. But in drawing his resolution, he put it to investigate whether any Congressman had been bribed by Oskes Ames. Gen. Butler, when Blaine's resolution was read in the House, Bulleving, as he says, that it would be likely that Mr. Ames had only dealt with the Kepublican ember; and he promptly denied his having had any of

members of Congress, and that if any of the Democratio members of Congress, and that if any of the Democratio members had been bribed with the stock it was probably done by somebody class, asked Mr. Blaine to amend his resolution by putting in the worls "or others" after Oake \$A mee's name; so that it might be assertanted whether somebody class had approached the Democratic side of the House, and a full investigation of both sides could be had. The resolution passed with the amendment, and a majority of the opposition was put on the Committee, on the ground that there was no Democrat or Greeley man who had been approached, as that was the theory upon which Mr. Biaine's resolution was started.

mittee, Butler, to bold the investigation in that from and also asked for the use of the Clerk of his Committee, as Clerk of this new Committee. No objection was made to that, and the cerk went on duty. This may account for all the newspaper talk about Butler's shorthand writer being in the Committee-room. Butler declares that he has never asked his shorthand writer what occurred in the Committee, nor has been told by him, as he has other means of gaining such information as he desires, beside corrupting his subordinales. THATIMONY OF M'COMB.

Mr. McComb was called before the Committee and produced Oakes Amer's letters. He said he was an unwilling witness; that he did not want anything done about this; that he wanted to try his lawsuit in his own way, and not before Congress, as they could not decide it for him; but he was there to do what the Committees ordered. They told him he must go on and state he knew about the matters to be investigated, wh

did.

At a certain point in the investigation a question was put to him by the Committee, something to this effect;
Question—You now testify only to what Mr. Amea and told you as regards this matter. Do you know of any lody of your own knowledge receiving this stock † What you have said is all hearsay.

Answer—I had rather not answer that question.

The Committee decided he must answer it.

CONGRESSMAN BROOKS.

A. I know of but one man who did receive it; I sat at the beard in the directors' room of the Union Pacific Railroad and heard another director of the board and Mr. James' Brooks arranging about his having Crédit Mobilier stock; the director didn't want to give him but 25 shares, and Brooks wanted to, on the ground that he was to take care of the Damocratic part of the House; it was finally arranged that he as shares should be given to Mr. Nellson, Brooks's son-in-law, and that it should be put back to cover all the dividends, the directors having at last consented to give him that much; that is all I know of my own knowledge.

The substance of this testimony was published, whereupon Mr. Brooks came into the House the next day and, under the gulse of a personal explanation, made a fearful onsigniful upon McComb, accusing him of all manner of crimes, and that he had been convicted during the war of cheating the soldiers. This very much disturbed McComb, who is said to stand very well in the community where he hives.

M'COMB BECOMES A WILLING WITNESS. Railroad and heard another director of the board and

M'COMB BECOMES A WILLING WITNESS.

After thinking it over, Mr. McComb decided to go before the Committee and say to thom this in substance : "When I was before you before I stated I knew of but one man who had this stock of my own knowledge. That was true then and it is true now. I have seen Mr. That was true then and it is true now. I have seen Mr. Brooks's explanation, and, while I had no desire to be brought into collision with Mr. Brooks, I was bound to state the truth under my oath; and now he has made it necessary for me to ge further, and state that I know, not of my own knowledge, but I can prove by witnesses, that Mr. Brooks not only had this 50 shares or stock, but that he has had 160 more shares of Credit Mobilier stock, and that he has received \$150,000 and more of dividends or increase on account of owning stock of the Credit Mobilier; and if you will examine the books of the Credit Mobilier, and if you will examine the books of the Credit Mobilier and witnesses whom I will name, the truth will appear. One of the witnesses is Mr. Thomas C. Durant, who is now suing for the 50 shares back. I domand that you send for and examine these witnesses, as due to myself and to Congress and the poople." MR. AMES AND HIS PRIENDS.

There the investigation terminated by the adjournment for the holidays. But in the meantime there was another matter which was troublesome to everybody. Mr. Ames, as before stated, had said in answer in the lawsuit that there were no such letters, and that there was no such stock list as Mr. McComb had charged in his bill and testified to before the Committee. Mr. Bard-well of Boston, as well as two or three other gentlemen, had seen McComb's stock list, and Ames had told them the same story that he had told McComb, as McComb testifies.

the same story that he had tone account, as account testifies.

It would seem that some of the gentlemen who had made denints, expected and might have desired Ames to go before the Committee and aftern his sworn answer in the chancery suit, denying that he had ever distributed the stock or written the letters and the stock hat produced by McComb, so that they all might continue in their denials made in the papers, that hey had ever had any stock; and everybody would thus have got out of the scandal, except Ames, who might be hadly damaged by any evidence that might be produced from Mr. Bardwell and others of the fact that Ames had said over and over again that the had distributed the stock to the persons charged.

AMES NOT WILLING TO BE A SCAPEGOAT.

AMES NOT WILLING TO BE A SCAPEGOAT. It probably occurred to Mr. Amos that the result of any such course as this, in addition to testifying falsely in fact, would simply be to make him a scapegoat, be cause the letters and stock-list would be proved upon him, and the fact that he had said he could bribe any him, and the fact that he had said he could office any member of Congress had been sworn to by McComb, and if Ames had falsified to that extent about his fellow-members and in fact never did distribute the stock to anybody, there could be no reason shown why he should not be expelled for so grave misconduct, and everybody clase would go clear. It must have suggested their to Mr. Ames that such might be the result of any attempt to screen his fellow-members further, if he tried to do so; whereas if he came out and told the exact truth, of course, not saying he had brided anybody, and it was very clear that he could

any attempt to screen his rehow-themsers ruther, if he tried to do so; whereas if he came out and told the exact truth, of course, not saying he had bribed anybody, and it was very clear that he could not have bribed anybody unless somebody had consented to be bribed, and as the House could not expel a member of Congress for bribing any other members, unless the House also expelled the member who was bribed, and as that would be a pretty large business, hardly to be got through with before the end of Congress, on the 4th of March next, Ames naturally and morally came to the conclusion to tell the truth about the distribution of the stock and his letters to McComb, of course denying that in giving stock to anybody that was worth 8100 per share for 8100 paid the Company for it anybody supposed there was any wrong or bubery in the transaction.

Therefore Mr. Ames went and employed a very competent counsel, not to cover up any transaction of anybody, but whose business it was to exert all his ability to save his client; and Mr. Ames depended upon Mr. Cushing's tudgment as to the course he should take. Ames, therefore, if we may believe the report, went before the Committee and made a clean breast of it, so far as the distribution of the stock was concerned. He stated exactly to whom he gave the stock, exactly what was done with it, the dividends and his agreement to hold it in trust, and that some of them had brought it back, since the publication and the denials, and wanted him to take it back, and stated that others still had it, generally stating the facts exactly as McComb had testified, and pretty much the facts as they were, so far as the acts done were concerned, but insisted that everybody's motives were good and pure in taking the stock is unfortunately traced by Ames's own statement into the hands of many gentlemen whose names have been published on the stock list; and their connection with it, and the denials of ever having had it, are to be explained as well as they can be.

MR. AMES BEFORE THE COMMITTEE. Ames, if report of testimony is correct, went to Bout-well and wanted him to invest in this stock. Mr. Boutwell, looking upon it's a matter of investment, said, in substance: "I have no money and cannot invest in it." Ames said: "Hwill carry the stock for you." Boutwell replied: "I don't care about having anybody carry stock for me that I don't bay for. I am not accustomed to get under obligations that I am not able to discharge at any time." Mr. Boutwellasked Mr. Alley about the stock, who represented it as good, but Boutwell concluded to have nothing to do with it. There were others who did it and did have the dividends. But when McComb came out with these disclosures some of them tried to give it back. It is said that one gentleman of high position went wirn tears in his eyes to Mr. Ames and wanted the stock taken back.

ANOTHER GREAT SWINDER Ames said: "Hwill carry the stock for you." Boutwell

ANOTHER GREAT SWINDLE.

About two years ago last Summer, Mr. Boutwell, being secretary of the Treasury, came across this state of facts in relation to the Union Pacific Railroad; that is to say, the Government had agreed while the road was building that it would not ask the payment of the interest on that is would not ask the payment of the interest of their bonds, but half of the earnings of the road in doing Government business, carrying its mails and troops; and that applied to the Union Pacific and Central Pa-cific and all the Pacific railroads; and there were a great many Pacific railroads who got those bonds—some of them now linished and others which never will be. Thereupon Boutwell called on the managers of the roads, and said: "Your roads are built, and I do not see Thereupon Boutwell called on the managers of the roads, and said: "Your roads are built, and I do not see any reason why the Government should be paying you for carrying troops and its malls while you over interest. I propose to have you offset all your earnings doing Government business against the interest, which the Government has to pay for you every year on bonds which the Government give you. And they pay the balance, because the mortgage which secures these bonds is not too valuable now, and if dobt accumulates the interest for thirty years till the bonds are due, it will become less and less valuable each year." The roads remonstrated against this, and said they had borrowed the money on thurty years; and, although the United States were paying the interest yoarly on these bonds, yet the plain construction of the law under which they were issued was that the Pacille Railroads should not pay any interest until the whole mortgage became due, at the end of thirty years. By this time the debts and interest compounded every six months, as the Government pays it, would come to about one-fifth of a quarter of the national debt. Mr. Boutwell said: "I cannot agree to that construction at all, because the Government is bound to pay its interest every six months, and you ought to pay at least yearly your interest;" and he was pertinactions, and stuck to that proposition, decided that the roads should pay their interest.

Because of this decision stock fell from 30 to 15, and the first mortgage bonds, which had been divided among these Credit Mobiller gentlemen, fell from 70 or 75 to 26;

Because of this decision stock fell from 30 to 15, and the first mortgage bonds, which had been divided among these Credit Mobilier gentlemen, felt from 70 or 75 to 26; and it falled Ames, of coarse, and rendered pretty much worthless all the immense dividends of the Credit Mobilier, because if a man takes a stock or bond dividend at 85 and it falls to 26, it makes quite a difference in his assets. The Pacific bonds went to Congress, and asked Congress to pass an act to postpone the payment of this interest for 30 years, overruing Mr. Boutwell. Mr. Dawes was chalrman of the Committee on Appropriations, and of course it came before his committee, and the required law was reported on an amendment to the Army offit, and under the operation of the previous question, it passed through the House. The history of this legislation will be found in the Winter of 1671, in The Congressional Globs.

It will be seen how the law was passed through both Houses, Dostpobling the payment of this interest for thirty years.

The consequence of this law was that the Pacific Rail-

road bonds took an upward tendency, and the dividends of the Credit Mobilier, which Ames held in trust for his brother members, again became very valuable. He could not carry it as trustee without aid, for he had falled, unless resened by this proceeding, as he was; and if he did not carry it, those for whom he held it in trust would lose the investment. So the vote in Congress postponing the payment of the interest resened not only the estate of Ames, but the dividends of all the Credit Mobilier stock in trust, and it so stands on the books. Nobody's name appears; it stands "Oakes Ames, in trust," for whom it may concern. Mr. Ames has now furnished the testimony as to who the people for whom he has held and still holds the stock may be. These parties have the dividends, as he proves, and some of them have pad them back. It is said by the newspers that come out in defense of Mr. Dawes, for exercise, that he hought stock and for the stock of the carries. of them have paid them back. It is said by the newspapers that come out in defense of Mr. Dawes, for example, that he bought stock and paid for the stock at
par vaine. But he did this and received the dividends
at the time when it was worth 300 or 400 per cent, and
be held it until the public disclosures were made, and
acted in Concress while he held it in behalf of the Paeithe road. He will tell when and why he gave it back to
Ames, if it is a proper transaction, or Ames will.

ME. BOUTWELL AND MR. DAWES. It is also said by the same newspapers in defense of Mr. Dawes, that Mr. Boutwell and he stand in regard to the stock in precisely the same condition, and are subject to the same condemnation. The similarity of the positions of Mr. Dawes and Mr. Boutwell is, that the stock was effered to Mr. Boutwell and he refused utterly to have anything to do with it. The stock was offered to Dawes; he took it and kept it, paying \$100 a share for

M: Dawes; he took it and kept it, paying \$100 a share for it is times, when Mr. Ames was refusing, according to his own letters, to sell his atour to anybody but Congression for \$500 per share, suggesting at the same time set is mator Grimes might sell some of his for \$50, hut will was, in fact, worth more than \$400 per share, caward paid nearly a thousand. Mr. Boutwell also, gave his vote against everything the road wanted; Mr. Dawes always gave his vote and his influence for everything the road wanted. Mr. Boutwell never doned that he had the stock, when he never did have it; Mr. Dawes did deny, as all the people upderstood his letters, having had any of this stock, when he did have it.

Mr. Boutwell, as Secretary of the Treasury, ordered the Pacific Kalironds to pay up their interest due the Inflied States from their earnings out of the Government assness.

asiness.

Mr. Dawes, Chairman of the Committee of Congress, agreed to report and voted for a law to allow the roads to postpone the payment of the interest due the Government for 20 years, and thereby allow the roads to get from the Government pay for carrying all the troops and malls, amounting to millions yearly, while the road pays nothing until the debt so accumulates from the accrued interest that the roads will be worthless to the Government as a scourity for what they owe.

In view of these facts, which it will be difficult to controvert, the similarity of the positions of Mr. Boutwell and Mr. Dawes in regard to the Union Pacific Road and the Credit Mobilier business will hardly be discernible

the Credit Mobilier business will hardly be discernible with the naked eye. The positions of both, it is to be hoped, for the honor of the State, are perfectly tenable. They are certainly

not alike.

Meanwhile the people of the Commonwealth had better wait, suspend their opinions, read the testimony as it is developed, and give that uncerting judgment upon the question that a whole people always do upon men's acts when they know all the facts.

TESTIMONY OF SPEAKER BLAINE.

The first witness called was Speaker Blaine, who testified as follows:

I wish to state without reservation or qualification that I never owned a share of stock in the Credit Mobilwhatever; nor did I receive either directly or indirectly a single cent derived in any manner or shape from the Credit Mobiller, or from the Union Pacific Railroad Company; no person holds or ever did hold for me any stock in either corporation as agent or trustee in any capacity whatever; I wish my testimony to be taken as exhaustive and as intended to exclude every form or phase of ownership in the Crédit Mobilier or the Union Pacific Railread, both past and present; I desire further to state that some time in the Spring of 1868-the precise date I will not affirm-Mr. Oakes Ames asked me one day if I would like to purchase some stock in the Crédit Mobilier; he said it would prove a good investment, and he could sell me 10 shares of the stock at a rate somewhat above par-I think some \$1,060 for the 19 shares; we had some conversation in regard to the matter, and Mr. Ames told me very frankly that, in regard to these shares, there was a lawsuit either pending or threatened, though he said his right to sell the shares was perfect and undoubted; I concluded that I did not desire to purchase the stock, and therefore de-clined Mr. Ames's offer; I beg to say, however, in justice to Mr. Ames, but more especially in justice to myself, that it never once occurred to me that he was trying to bribe me or in any way influence my vote or action as a Representative; I understood him to say that he was the owner of more of the stock than he wished to carry, and was offering some of it to friends at cost and interest to him, a slight advance over par value. The amount offered me was very small and made little impression on my mind; indeed, was well nigh forgotten until recalled by the incidents which led to this investigation; Mr. Ames never offered me any of the stock at any other time than as I have just narrated, nor was any of the stock ever offered to me at any time by any other person or corporation. Mr. Ames was present when Mr. Blain gave his testimony, and stated that it accorded with his own recollections of the conversation between them on the 13th of December.

CROSS-EXAMINATION OF OAKES AMES. [The following did not appear in the First Edition of yesterday's Thinkone.]

Q. And the same with Mr. Allison t A. I am not cer-tain about Mr. Allison; I have not so distinct a recollec-

Q. He received the 10 shares of stock! A. Oh, yes; he received 10 sources of stock, and paid for it.

Q. What was the arrangement made with them by which they were to become stockholders? A. That was before the time that the stock was awarded to me for distribution; they both said that they were promised 50 shares each, but I could only give them 10; Mr. Wilson said that he had been promised 50 shares of the stock and could only get 10.

said that he had been promised 50 shares of the stock and could only get 10.

Q. And they have continued to be owners of that stock unless they have disposed of it to somebody clse! A. Yes, Sur, Mr. Wilson disposed of his some time ago.

The Speaker, in connection with the question about Messrs. Wilson and Allison, remarked to the Committee that in the KList Congress there was an investigation in regard to the alleged sale of cadeiships which had led to serious proceedings in the House, and that the Committee on Mintary Affairs, which had the investigation in charge, acted on its own judgment, which it was afterward, in some form, decided by the House it had no power to do, and which it was out of the pale of propriety for it to investigate the transactions of men who had been in Congress, but who had returned to civil life. He merely wanted to make the suggestion to the Committee, all the proceedmake the suggestion to the Committee, all the proceed-ings before that Committee in the XLIST Congress touching any member of the prior Congress had been erased from the record, and no report of it made to the

House.

The Chairman—It is very clear that we cannot deal with Mr. Wilson and Mr. Allison in any way; but, perhaps, we may with Mr. Ames.

Mr. McCary—If we go on with the inquiry in regard to those ex-members, of course they must have a hearing if they desire it. Mr. McCrary—I' we go on with the inquiry in regard to those ex-members, of course they must have a hearing if they desire it.

The Chairman, to the witness—Q. As to Senator Conk-ling, you say that he never was the owner of any stock, and that there never were any negotiations between him and you! A. No, Sir; he never had any stock and never-paid for any, and never received any dividends from me, to my knowledge.

HE EXPLAINS HIS LETTERS TO M'COMB. The Chairman handed to the witness the letters pro-

duced the other day by Mr. McComb, and the witness identified them as in his own handwriting. Q. Were those letters written at the various dates they

bear 1 A. Probably; unless I made a mistake in the date; they were intended to be correct.

Q. In the letter of the earliest date, Jan. 25, 1898, you say "that you (I) have assigned as far as you (I) have gone to—4 from Massachusetts, I from New-Hampshire; I, Delaware; I, Tennessee; and I, as it seems to have been changed by pencil to 2, Ohio 2, Pennsylvania; I, Indiana; I, Maine," You were writing, I suppose, in reference to the stock of the Credit Mobilier 1 A. Yes, Sir.

Q. What did you intend by saying that you had Q. What did you intend by saying that you had assigned as far as you had gone; do these figures refer to persons or to quantities? A. To persons.

Q. They had no reference to the amount of stock, but to the number of persons in each State? A. That is it.

Q. You say, "I have assigned as far as I have gone to four from Massachusetts;" now, who were the four Massachusetts persons to whom you referred? A. I meant that I intended to give it out to four from Massachusetts.

setts.

Q. You say that you "have assigned as far as you have gone!" A. What I meant by saying that I had "assigned" was that was my intention; for instance, I said that I had assigned one to Delaware, whereas, I had not spoken at the time to Senator Bayard, for whom I had intended it; so, too, to Senator Foweier of Ten-I had intended it; so, too, to Senstor Foweler of Tennessee; but my intention was to assign stock to each of them; this letter was drawn out from me by a letter from Mr. McComb, wanting me to give \$5.000 in stock to Senstor Bayard of Delaware and \$5.000 to Senstor Powler of Tennessee. This stock was given to me to distribute as I saw fit, and I was intending to give some to Senstor Bayard and Senstor Powler; that is, not to give it to them but to sell it to them. That was the way that I intended to place the stock, but I had not so placed it. Q. Then the real meaning of the letter is that that is what you had designed to do! I twas in answer to a letter from Mr. McComb desiring that his friends should have stock. I think that Mr. Wilson of Iewa was one whom he mentioned.

Q. This letter says: "The 50 per cent increase on the old stock I want for distribution here!" A. The old old stock I want for distribution here i" A. The old stock was the 90 shares that I got afterward; my recollection is this: That the 58 shares were the number unallotted of the original stock before it was increased 50 per cent; I did not get but 93 shares, while I should have got 135; that is my recollection of it.

Q. In the last part of this letter you say "Quigley has been here!" A. That refers to another matter altogether.

gether.

Q. Mr. McComb was correct in saying that that has no reference to the affair of the Crédit Mobilier? A. Yes, Sir; that is the truth.

Q. Now, in reference to this list of names in the letter of January 30, Mr. McComb says that the memorandum of the names was made by him by your reading these sames from some memorandum-book or pocket-book of the names was made by him by your reading these
names from some memorandum-book or pockst-book
where you had them entered. Now, will you state what
you know in regard to that transaction 1 A. I might
nave mentioned names that I intended to give stock to,
as I stated in the free part of the letter names of persons I intended to give stock to,
Q. Did you have that list of names in a pocket-book or

memorandum-bock? or did you read that list of names to him from any book of papers? A. I cannot say; I may have had a memorandum of names of persons to whom I intended to sell stock.

Q. Do you remember whether you had or not? A. I am not positive; very likely? had a memorandum of persons on that list whom I did not sell stock to, and the amounts in the list were not the amounts that I gave, so that it could not have been token from my list that McComb saw.

Q. In this list he says, "Oakes Amea's list of names as

Q. In this list he says, "Oakes Ames's list of names as shown to me to-day for Crédit Mobilier-Blaine of Maine, 300;" did you say anything to him about Mr.

Maine, 300;" did you say anything to him about Mr. Blaine! A. No. Sir; I do not recollect; I may have mentioned the names that I intended to sell stock to:
Q. Do you recollect whether you mentioned Mr. Blaine's name! A. I do not.
Q. He says that you gave him the name of Mr. Blaine as one of those who were to receive \$3,000, or \$9 shares!
A. Tant could not be correct; Mr. Blaine's name may have been mentioned, but Mr. Blaine's name was never in any idea of mine to have more than \$1,000.
Q. Was there any talk between you and Mr. Blaine about his having more than ten shares! A. I have no

thou of it at ail; I am very certain that there "Patterson of N. H., 3,000." Do you recollect

Q. "l'atterson of N. H., 3,000." Do you recollect whether you mentioned Senator Patterson's name to him! A. I do not: I cannot recollect; I may have told him and I may have had a list of persons to whom I intended to sell stock; we did not mean to give away any.

Q. You do not mean to have us understand that you ever gave anybody shares of stock! A. No, Sir, never.

Q. Did any member of Congress ever receive any shares from you except by paying for them! A. No, Sir, never.

shares from you except by paying for them? A. A., 5.5. hever.

Q. "Patterson of N. H., 3.000;" how many shares did he (Patterson) have? A. Thirty shares; that is correct.

Q. Mr. Patterson did have 30 shares? A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Wilson of Massachusetts, \$2,000—you have told us all that there was in regard to that? A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Painter reports for Pennsylvania \$3,000? A. Yes, Sir; he had 30 shares.

Q. He because a stockholder? A. Yes, Sir; he said he was promised more, and was very indignant that he did not get 50 shares.

Q. S. Colfax, Speaker? A. Yes, Sir; that is according to my testimony.

to my testimony.

Q. Elliott of Massachusetta 23† A. He did not have any.

Q. Dawes of Massachusetts? A. Mr. Dawes had two

Q. Did you tell Mr. McComb that Mr. Dawes was to have 20 shares 1 A. No. Sir.

Q. Were there ever any negotiations for his having more than 10 shares 1 A. No. Sir: he never talked about investing more than \$1,000, which he wanted to buy a bond for, and I toli him I thought that his was a bester

investment.
Q. Boutwell's? A. Mr. Boutwell never had any. He was one of the men from Massachusetts to whom I intended to sell stock.
Q. Do you recollect whether you said anything to McComb about Mr. Boutwell? A. I don't know what names I did mention to Mr. McComb; all that I know is that Mr. Boutwell was at one time intended; if I said anything to McComb about him, it was about what I intended to do.

anything to McComb about him, it was about what I intended to do.

Q. State whether in any of those negotiations with members of Congress there was any purpose on your part of exercising any influence over them or to corrupt them in any way! A. I never dreamed of it; I did not know that they required it, because they were all friends of the road and my friends; if you want to bribe a man you want to bribe one who is opposed to you, not to bribe one who is your friend.

Q. In the transaction that you had with them, had you any view of obtaining the influence or aid for efforts in Congress. A. No sir; all my idea was to have enough people interested to look into the matter. We did not want any legislation from Congress. We did not know in 1867, but that Jim Fisk and Judge Barnard were going to drive us out of New-York, and we did not know but we would have to ask to have our office removed to Boston. I never made a promise to or got one from any member of Congress in my life, and I would not dare to attempt it.

member of Congress in my life, and I would not date to attempt it. rick—Had you promised to all these mem-bers of Congress mentioned in this written state-ment to procure for them atock of the Crédit Mobilier! A. I cannot recollect, there were so many who talked to me about getting an interest in it when they began to think it was a good thing; I cannot recollect all the names; I do not know whether they had all spoken to me before; I know that several of them did.

whether they had all speken to me before; I know that several of them did.

Q. Can you specify any of those who did? A. I do not know that I can.
Q. Please state which of them did so as far as you recollect? A. I have no doubt that Mr. Scofield did, and Messra. Patterson, Dawes, Bingham, and Wilson.
Q. Any others? A. I think that Mr. Colfax did; it is very difficult for me to remember dates.
A. I was not isking the dates, but the names. A. I have given the names as far as I recollect? I cannot be positive as to all of them; I remember distinctly that these were previous to that time, and it is my impression that most of them—perhaps all of thom were—but I not certain.
Q. Can you state how long it was before the time that the stock was offered to you that you had these conversations with these gentlemen? A. Probably a few months before the session of Congress—the Summer before.

SECOND DAY'S CROSS-EXAMINATION OF OAKES AMES.

By Mr. Merrick-In these letters, copies of which have een filed with the Committee, of the 25th of January, the 30th of January, the 22d of February, 1868, you refer to letters of Mr. McComb of the 23d and 28th of January, to letters of Mr. McComb of the 2sa and 22th of Sannay, and the first of February, and your letters are replies to these letters. Have you the letters of Mr. McComb to which these are a reply? A. No. Sir; I do not think I have; I do not generally keep letters unless they are business letters of importance; there may be some of them among my own letters at Easton.

Q. These seem to be business letters? A. Relating to this matter, yes; If I were shown any answers, they would refresh my memory as to what they are answers to.

swers to.

Q. Have you examined among your papers to see whether you have these letters still? A. No, Sir; my papers are at Easton, Mass.; I think very likely I burned these letters, as I generally did those not considered important; I did not suppose anything in these letters would ever be considered as referring to bribery or anything the suppose anything in these letters would ever be considered as referring to bribery or anything the suppose anything the suppose.

ant. Q. In your letter of Jan. 30, you refer to a letter of Mr. McComb of the 29th, inclosing a copy of a letter from,

thing of that sort, and I did not regard them as important.

Q. In your letter of Jan. 30, you refer to a letter of Mr. McComb of the 28th, inclosing a copy of a letter from, or rather to, Mr. King, in which you say, "I don't fear any investigation here;" state whether you have that letter of Mr. Kings's A. I cannot tell you; it is among my papers at Easton, if I have it; I recollect very well the substance of the letter referred to in both cases.

Q. What did they refer to? A. The first letter of Mr. McComb wanted me to dispose of some of this stock to his friend Senator Bayard and his friend Senator Fowler; I wrote back that I had seen Mr. Fowler, but I had never been introduced to Mr. Bayard.

Q. You state in your answer referred to here, of Jan. 28, 1886, "you say I must not put too much in one locality;" in your letter of Jan. 30, you say, "I do not fear any investigation here;" did the letter you received from Mr. McComb refer to any investigation called for or threatened? A. I cannot say; I presume not; I know it was frequently alleged in our New-York consultations that there would be an investigation into the affairs of the Pacific Railroad, and I always said I would like to have an investigation; I knew that I had never done anything that I feared to have investigated; it was alleged that things had been done before I had any connection with the road, in connection with obtaining the original charter, which would not bear investigation. About that time C. C. Washburn made a speech in the House of Representatives, finding fault with the ratio established, and wanting fault with the ratio established, and wanting to have them investigated, charging that they were building a poor road, were trying to cheat the Government, and were charging a great deal too much in the ratio established.

Q. Have you kept any memorandum or any entries of these various transactions with different members of Congress receiving stock from the Crédit Mobilier or Union Pacific Railroad Company? A. I do not know whether I have n

Q. Is it your habit as a matter of business in conducting various transactions with different persons to do it without making any memoranda! A. This was my habit, but within a year or two I have had no book-keeper, and I used to keep all my own matters in my own way, and very careless I admit; I do not know that have any memoranda relating to these transactions; still I may have.

Q. Were your answers and statement in reference to these various transactions with members of Congress contained in your written testimony from memory and not from records, memoranda, or books! A. From memory; I had no records or memoranda to refer to.

WHO GAVE THE STOCK BACK.

WHO GAVE THE STOCK BACK. Q. What members of Congress requested you, during the Autumn, to return to them the money they had in-vested in Credit Mobilier stock 1 A. I do not know that any of them asked me ttofreturn their money last Au-

Q. I understand you to say in your statement that during last Autumn you were asked by certain members of Congress to return the money they had given you, and did so? A. Ithink you must be mistaken in regard to last Autumn. What I referred to was before that, but soo related to another matter.

Q. You do not know what members of Congress they were, if there were any, who made a request of you last Autumn to return their money? A. I do not remember any who asked me to return their money.

Q. You say that you do not know of any requesting you to return their money and cancel the stock during last Autumn? A. Some of them sent me stock they had received.

Q. Who sent you stock A. Mr. Elison sent me stock.
Q. Is he a member of the House of Representatives i Q. What members of the present Congress asked you during last Summer or Autumn to return their money and take back their stock! A. I do not think any of them asked that last Autumn; I think, you are mistaken

and take back their stock! A. I do not think any of them asked that, last Autum; it think, you are mistaken in the time.

Q. What members of Congress at any time asked you to return the money and received back the stock! A. Mr. Dawes and Mr. Bingham.

Q. When did Mr. Dawes ask that! A. After that suit was brought by Mr. McComb; I think it was in the Autumn of 1880 or 1889; it was as long ago as that.

Q. When did you cancel the transaction with Mr. Bingham! A. I think perhaps in 1870 or 1871.

Q. Did all these gentiemen pay you money for the stock you had assigned to them, or proposed to assign them! A. Not for what! proposed to assign to them; they paid the money for the stock assigned to them.

Q. Did any of them pay morethan the par value of the stock! A. Mr. Dawes paid the par value and interest, and so did Mr. Bingham.

Q. How much did Mr. Dawes pay you! A. He paid me \$1,000 and interest.

Q. Was it \$1,000 or \$2,500! A. I. was \$2,000. Mr. Bingham!

terest.
Q. Was it \$2,000 or \$2,500 ? A. I: was \$2,000; Mr. Bing-ham gave me \$2,500 to invest for nim.

WHO RECEIVED DIVIDENDS. Q. Did you pay those gentlemen any dividend upon their stock ? A. Yea, Sir. Q What dividend did you pay them f A. I cannot

declared ! A. I did not pay them any dividend, I think, after this suit was commenced.
Q. Did you pay them any dividends at any time! A. Yes, Sir.
Q. What dividends did you pay them! A. I paid them what was received.

Q. Did you pay them all the dividends that had so rued up to the time of bringing this suit! A. I think!

O. This suit was docketed in November, 1883. Did you pay them all the dividends that had been declared, prior to November, 1863? A. It is my impression that I did.—Q. Can you state what these dividends were? A. I around.

O Can you state what these dividends were? A 1 cannot.

Q. Was there a dividend April 1, 1857, of 50 per cent payable in first mortgage bonds of the U. P. R. R. Co. A. That could not have belonged to this stock; that was a little before they bought; it was a dividend declared prior to the time this stock was set apart.

Q. Did you pay them any dividends which were declared as early as July 1, 1867 I a dividend of 150 per cent on Union Pacific Railroad stock? A. No. Sir. I think not; I think that did not belong to this stock at all; I nave no such recollection.

Q. Did you pay them any dividend declared Jan. 4, 1808, of 80 per cent first mortgage bonds of the U. P. R. R. and ou the same day a dividend of 160 per cent. U. P. R. R. atock? A. I cannot say; I presume I did; some of them never paid for their stock, and were therefore not entitled to the dividend.

Q. Can you distinguish among those you dealt with at to who paid and who did not pay, and as to who actually received their dividends? A. I think Mr. Eingliam has his dividends in full, and I think Mr. Fattersen did.

Q. Did Mr. Dawes? A. I think he had it up to the time he declined to take the stock; he declined carry, on account of this suit of Duff Green's, as they called it.

Q. Did you pay them a dividend, declared July 3, 1863, of 15 per cent Union Pacific Railroad stock, and on the same day a dividend of 75 per cent first mortgage bonds in the mortgage bonds on the conditions in which they received the more garge bonds union Pacific Railroad company! A. It is my impression that I did; I do not recollect; it depended on the conditions in which they received the stock; some took up their stock, and some did not pay, and therefore did not get their dividends, of course.

Q. And of all these diversified transactions you say you have no memorandum i A. I have none here; I may have at home.

Q. Will you examine and see if you have such memorandum I A. I will.

randum I A. I will.

VALUE OF THE DIVIDENDS. Q. Did you receive these dividends upon the 250 shares and 90 shares spoken of as declared at these respective times? A. It is my impression that I did; I have no

reason to doubt it.
Q. They were assigned to you, if I understand, upon your claim to the Company that you had made arrange-

your claim to the Company that you had made arrangements with certain gentlemen to transfer the shares to them! A. My statement is that people applied to me for stock, and that I promised to get them some if I could; I took this stock for the purpose of carrying out this arrangement as far as I could.

Q. Were or were not these dividends which you say were distributed to these gentlemen up to and including Sept. 3, 1863, more than an equivalent to the same of money they had paid to you as the price of the stock!

A. Yes, Sir; I think they were.

Q. When these arrangements in reference to the transfer of this stock were resounded between you and these members of Congress, were the dividends which you had paid them returned to you, or were they retained by them! A. They were returned in some cases, and in some they have never been settled up yet.

Q. Be good enough to specify in what cases they were returned and in what retained! A. That I cannot tell.

Q. Can you tell the names of any Individuals who did return the dividends they had received! A. I think Mr. Dawes did and I think Mr. Scoffeid did.

THE ARRANGEMENT WITH CONGRESSMEN.

THE ARRANGEMENT WITH CONGRESSMEN. Q. What was your motive in endeavoring to induce

embers of Congress to become shareholders in the Crédit Mobiller and Union Pacific Railroad 7 A. My object was to have associated with us men of influence and ject was to have associated with us men of influence and character, who would investigate for themselves in regard to the privileges of the Union Pacific Bailroad.

Q. Investigate what? A. Investigate the whole matter; there was a prejudice against the Union Pacific Bailroad; it was charged that we were a set of scoundrels; also that we had committed all sorts of crimes against the public.

Q. Did you represent obexpiain to these gentlemen, or did they know incidentally, when they subscribed for this stock the arrangements you had made an reference to the Credit Mobilier and the relations in which the Credit Mobilier and the relations in which the Credit Mobilier and the relations in which the Credit Mobilier about to the Union Pacific Railroad? A. I do not know that I made any full explanation.

Q. Did you explain the character of the business transacted by the Credit Mobilier? A. I suppose I told them the Credit Mobilier was a contractor to build the Union Pacific Railroad; I suppose everybody knew that who knew anything about it.

Q. You supposed the relations between the Credit Mobilier and the Union Pacific Railroad to be a matter of public notoriety? A. Yes; everybody knew it; it was public.

Q. Were the terms and the nature of the contract

public notoriety I A. Yes; everybody knew it, a warpublic.
Q. Were the terms and the nature of the contract which is called the "Ames contract," which was assigned to the trustees for building 667 miles of the Union Pacific Railroad, known to those who were concerned as owners of the stock of the Credit Mobilier I A. I presume so; they would be very apt to know it.
Q. Would these members of Congress know it with whom you made arrangements to take stock in it! A. I cannot tell you.
Q. But it was a matter of public notoriety for everybody to know; there was no secreey about it! A. None whatever.

whatever.

Q. Had you any motives or purpose in soliciting the influence of these public gentiemen to take an interest in this Orielit Mobilier and Union Pacific Raliroad Company to avert inquiry that might be raised by the Government of the United States into the manner of conducting the affairs of the Union Pacific Raliroad A. No, the directors whose business it was to sit with us in every meeting of the Board, and it was their duty to protect the interest of the Government, which they did to such an extent as made the road cost us a great deal more than there was any necessity for.

Q. Did these five directors of the Union Pacific Rall-road know of the contracts made with the company in reference to building the road? A. The contract was made with Oakes Ames; the company had no interest in it.

reference to building the foat? A. The contract was made with Oakes Ames; the company had no interest in it.

Q. I mean the transfer of that stock to trustees? A. Yes, Sir.

Q. State whether the printed paper now handed to you is a correct copy of that contract? A. I presume it is.

Q. The paper I handed you is an exhibit connected with your answers in the Chancerv suit heretofore referred to, and sworn to by yourself and others. A. I presume it is correct: I do not know anything to the contrary; I could not answer fully without comparing it with the written interrogations to which It was in answer; I cannot teatify absolutely to the fact of its exactness because I have not the original to compare it with.

Q. Have you ever looked over these printed copies that purport to be copies of the answers of yourself and others to interrogatories propounded to you on the part of the complainant in that Chancery suit in Pennayl-vanta? A. I cannot say whether I have the printed copy or not; my signature purports to be attached to it.

Q. If you cannot say now I will ask you to take that paper and examine it before to-morrow? A. I cannot say whether I have the printed copy or not; my signature purports to be attached to it.

Q. If you cannot say now I will ask you to take that paper and examine it before to-morrow? A. I cannot say whether it is an exact copy without having the original to compare it with; I suppose it is correct; I have no reason to doubt it; I do not suppose the men would commit forgery in copying; there may be elerical errors; it seems to be substantially correct, and I am willing to admit that it is substantially correct, and I am willing to

FIRST THREATS OF INVESTIGATION.

Q. I ask you lift at or about the time when these transfers of stock were made by you to members of Congress there was any threat or rumor on the part of the government of the Union Pacific to cause an investigation to be made into the manner in which the affairs of the

to be made into the manner in which the affairs of the Union Pacific Raiiroad had been conducted? A. No, Sir; I do not know that there was; the matter of an investigation had been frequently talked over in New-York, and I always said I was in favor of it.

Q. Were ihere any movements in Congress looking to an investigation as to whether the charter of the Union Pacific Raiiroad had been forfeited at that time! A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Or any movement in Congress looking to the ascertainment, by the Attorney-General of the United States whether or not illegal dividends had been made, and to cause reimbursement thereo! A. I think some time after this; I should say a year after this stock was assigned Garrett Davis made such charges in a speech in the Senate.

the Senate.

Q. At the time this stock was assigned to you, or during your negotiation with a session of the control of the co during your negotiation with members of Congress, were there any movements made in Congress, or any rumors or suspicious of movements to be made in Con-gress looking to such results! A. No, Sir; not to my Q. Do you know when the first movement was made in

Q. Do you know when the first movement was made in Congress looking to the passage of the act of April 19, 1869, in the fourth section of which the Attorney-General was authorized to investigate whether the charter was not forfelfed find to ascertain if illegal dividends had been made, and to cause the reimbursement thereof, also to see whether any of the directors of the road or agents had violated any penal law! A. I think that grew out of the Garrett Davis speech to which I have referred, if I am not mistaken.

Q. I ask you if you know when the first movement was made in Congress looking to the passage of that hill! A. I cannot tell; I am the worst man to remember dates you ever saw: I resollect now there was such a resolution introduced into the Schate, and, if I am not mistaken, inquiry was made.

Q. The movement freened into this law of April, 1869 the Brooks's share.

MR. BROOMS'S SHARE.

Q. Have you any knowledge as to whether James Brooks of the House of Representatives has been the owner, directly or indirectly, of any stock in the Crédit Mobilier! A. No. Sir, I never knew of H.

Q. Or in the Union Pacific Raffronds A. I think he

Q. Or in the Union Pacific Railroads! A. I think he is an owner of stock in the Union Pacific Railroad; if he were not be could not be a director.

Q. Does not the law expressiy forbid Gevernment directors from owning any of that stock! As Ho was at one time a Government director.

The examination then continued.

Q. When did you commesce your negotiathors with public men and influential men, with a view of interesting them in this stock! A. When I first went in my self, some time I think in 1865, I argest my friends is go in; I arged Mr. Alley to go in, and guaranteed aim against loss; I induced Mr. samuel Hooper, a member of the House, and Senator Grimes, and a great many others out of Congress to become interested; every man of influence and capital that I could induce to go in, I cadeavored to induce; we wanted a great dat of money and a great deal of strength, and it was my object to associate in the corporation respectable and responsible men—men of character and standing both in public and private life.

Q. Did you solicit all the members of Congress to take stock! A. No; I think most of them solicited me; some of them! Solicited; I solicited Mr. Soulied when I first went in; he and I boarded together; I did not consider that there was any impropriety in owning stock in any corporation, particularly when we did not want anything of Congress; we asked no iegislation and expected hone, and there had been nothing asked or granted by the Government since that time that takes anything from the Government since that time that takes anything from the Government since that time that takes anything to the foregraph of the granted by the Government since that time that takes anything ten the Government since that time that takes anything from the Government or benefits the Union Facilie Railroad; the only thing I

recollect.

Q. Did you pay them all the dividends that had been have ever asked was the removal of the office from